

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

CRIM. CASE NO. 11-20314

v.

PAUL D. BORMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

JOHN BRAVATA and
ANTONIO BRAVATA,

Defendants.

/

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT JOHN BRAVATA'S MOTION TO
PERMIT HIM LIMITED HYBRID REPRESENTATION AT TRIAL**

Defendant John Bravata seeks to represent himself during certain portions of his upcoming trial. The Government has filed a response in opposition.

Defendant is represented by two outstanding criminal defense attorneys. As Defendant notes on page one of his brief in support of his motion, there is no constitutional right to hybrid representation. *McKaskle v. Wiggins*, 104 S.Ct. 944, 953 (1984): “*Farettta* does not require a trial judge to permit ‘hybrid’ representation of the type Wiggins was actually allowed.”

The Court declines to permit Defendant John Bravata to have limited hybrid representation to represent himself during portions of the upcoming trial.

Defendant’s Motion to permit limited hybrid representation is DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

DEC 27 2012

DATED:



PAUL D. BORMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE